

REMARKS

In the October 5, 2005 Office Action, the drawings were objected to and claims 1-8, 10, 13 and 14 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 9, 11 and 12 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the October 5, 2005 Office Action, Applicant has amended the specification and independent claim 1 as indicated above to include the limitations recited in claim 11 while Applicant has canceled claim 11. Moreover, independent claims 13 and 14 are also amended to include the limitations that substantially correspond to the limitations recited in claim 11. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Also, claim 12 has been amended to correct a typographical error in this claim. Thus, claims 1-10 and 12-14 are pending, with claims 1, 13 and 14 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Drawings

In the numbered paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) because Figure 5 includes an element 110a that is not mentioned in the description.

In response, Applicant has amended the paragraph [0042] of the specification to clarify the element 110a in Figure 5 in the description. Applicant believes no new matter is added by this amendment.

Applicant believes that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR §1.83(a). Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the numbered paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 8, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Laid-Open Patent

Publication No. 2000-238594 to Miki et al. (hereinafter "Miki et al. publication"). In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations recited in claim 11, which is indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Moreover, independent claims 13 and 14 are also amended to include the limitations that substantially correspond to the limitations recited in claim 11.

In particular, independent claims 1, 13 and 14 now recite determining an image displaying location that is a prescribed distance prior to one of the predetermined road regions that was detected, and displaying selected ones of the images *when the vehicle is detected to have passed the image displaying location*. Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Miki et al. publication or any other prior art of record.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose *each* and *every* element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13 and 14, as now amended, are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicant believes that the dependent claims 4 and 8 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 4 and 8 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the numbered paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 5-7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Miki et al. publication. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 as mentioned above.

More specifically, independent claim 1 now recites determining an image displaying location that is a prescribed distance prior to one of the predetermined road regions that was detected, and displaying selected ones of the images *when the vehicle is detected to have*

passed the image displaying location. Clearly this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Miki et al. publication or any other prior art of record.

It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art *suggests* the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for modifying the reference to create the Applicant's unique arrangement of vehicle surrounding area imaging system now recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, Applicant believes that the dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7 and 10 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7 and 10 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the numbered paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 9, 11 and 12 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations recited in claim 11 while Applicant has canceled claim 11 as indicated above. Moreover, Applicant has amended independent claims 13 and 14 to include limitations that substantially correspond to the limitations recited in claim 11. Thus, independent claims 1, 13 and 14 are believed to be allowable.

Prior Art Citation

In the numbered paragraph 7 of the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

Appl. No. 10/808,463
Amendment dated December 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2005

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-10 and 12-14 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



David L. Tarnoff
Reg. No. 32,383

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: 12-27-05

G:\12-DEC05-NTNS-US045025_Amendment.doc